

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut mezinárodních studií

PROTOKOL O HODNOCENÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE
(Posudek oponenta)

Práci předložil(a) student(ka): Jana Vatahová

Název práce: Media as a Factor of Electoral Apathy in the Czech Republic

Oponoval (u externích oponentů uveďte též adresu a funkci v rámci instituce): PhDr. David Emler, Ph.D.

1. OBSAH A CÍL PRÁCE (stručná informace o práci, formulace cíle):

The aim of the Master thesis is to address the question of drop in voter turnout during European Parliament elections. The studied examples are 2009 and 2014 polls in the Czech republic. The research question points at possible participation of mass media, specifically newspaper (namely tabloid Blesk and general news daily Mladá Fronta Dnes) in this phenomenon. The author has conducted quantitative and qualitative content analysis of EU-related articles published in the newsprint two months before elections.

2. VĚCNÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (náročnost, tvůrčí přístup, argumentace, logická struktura, teoretické a metodologické ukotvení, práce s prameny a literaturou, vhodnost příloh apod.):

The topic, selected data and literature, methodology, structure of the thesis and the final text fulfill completely the requirements of the Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague. The research design is well selected and correctly applied. Maybe only the vast collection of raw data in appendices wasn't necessary, as it does not bring any added value to the thesis.

3. FORMÁLNÍ A JAZYKOVÉ ZPRACOVÁNÍ (jazykový projev, správnost citace a odkazů na literaturu, grafická úprava, formální náležitosti práce apod.):

Formal aspects of the thesis are almost faultless; there are virtually zero misspellings or typos. I would only recommend the author to justify the text and always put the footnotes after punctuation. Some quotes are excessively indicated in three different ways: 1) detachment from the surrounding text, 2) quotation marks and 3) italics – in my opinion one method would serve well. Some tables are titled by mistake by Czech “tabulka”.

4. STRUČNÝ KOMENTÁŘ HODNOTITELE (celkový dojem z diplomové práce, silné a slabé stránky, originalita myšlenek, naplnění cíle apod.):

Author fulfilled the goal of the thesis. The quantitative drop of information given to the readers between 2009 and 2014 is in my opinion the most noteworthy outcome – this can be really considered as one of the reasons explaining the drop in voter turnout, yet author is very cautious when well aware of the difference between mere correlation and causality when doing this type of research. I find a slight disbalance in the thesis, when introduction and impressive context (albeit very bright and well written) count for approx. 2/3 of the text and the analysis and conclusions count only for about 1/3 of the writing. Last but not least, I consider the interpretation of the quantitative analysis a little thin, for it consists more in specific informations on the topics of the studied articles – I would welcome more extended reflexion, i.e. more generalized or summarized view on the ways how “european” topics are presented to the Czech reader.

5. OTÁZKY A PŘIPOMÍNKY DOPORUČENÉ K BLIŽŠÍMU VYSVĚTLENÍ PŘI OBHAJOBĚ (jedna až tři):

During the defense, I would recommend to ask the following questions: 1) What is the “weight” you ascribe to the media as a factor of “electoral apathy” in the Czech republic? 2) What are the other factors contributing to the studied phenomenon? 3) Is the proportion of these factors any different in other EU countries?

6. DOPORUČENÍ / NEDOPORUČENÍ K OBHAJOBĚ A NAVRHOVANÁ ZNÁMKA

(výborně, velmi dobře, dobře, nevyhovělo):

I recommend the thesis to proceed to the defense with my commendation; I suggest the “**excellent**” grade (“**výborně**” in Czech).

Datum: 8 June 2015

Podpis: PhDr. David Emler, Ph.D.